To FCC Chairman Julius Genachowski, Commissioners Michael Copps, Robert McDowell, Mignon Clyburn, and Meredith Atwell Baker and to whom this may concern at the U.S. Department of Justice

It was announced on March 14 that AT&T would join their telecom peers in beginning to limit the amount of data that AT&T DSL and AT&T U-verse Internet customers can consumer every month to 150 GB and 250 GB, respectively.

By capping our internet usage, AT&T will be preventing us from making the most of today's wonderful streaming video technologies, such as Netflix, Amazon streaming, YouTube, Hulu, and more.

AT&T claims that this has everything to do with ensuring the best experience for all its users, though, AT&T is unfairly exempting their own video services from this arbitrary cap. This is ISP discrimination against competing product/services and against users choosing such alternatives. This is why we need the federal government to mandate common carrier Title II Network Neutrality rules of nondiscrimination on fixed and mobile broadband to prevent unfair and unnecessary ISP discrimination by giant service providers with a conflict of interest to provide sub-par service -- and charge more for less service. Also this is why we need more competition in both fixed wire-line broadband and mobile broadband services. Don't let AT&T T Mobil merger shrinking competition for voice services (reducing wireless phone market and mobile broadband to a near duopoly status where two companies AT&T and Verizon Wireless control 80% of wireless market limiting competition and consumer choices. If this merger is approved and Sprint Nextel gets bought out next or goes out of business (by the way Sprint opposes the merger) we will have a duopoly. IT IS UNACCEPTABLE THAT THESE ISPs refuse to accept common carrier regulations on them but masquerade as public utility companies refusing to accept any regulation at all that public utilities have to comply with. This double standard of being a public utility but not wanting to be regulated as one must end. Also Universal Service Reform is needed. Stop giving taxpayer subsidies to big telecom and cable companies to expand broadband deployment who want to engage in ISP discrimination. Any companies taking public money should be obligated morally and legally to comply with transparency requirements and with the public interest.

The quality of AT&T's services now stink -- AT&T since being allowed to re-merge with SBC Communications and Bell South has opted to discontinue network infrastructure investments to expand bandwidth and repair and/or expand its networks and instead choose to limit our access to the World Wide Web. We need a free and open Internet that encourages public participation free of corporate gatekeepers like Ma Bell without corporate censorship, or discrimination of any legal content or services online regardless of the source or destination of IP packets.

Broadband is an advanced telecommunications service and should be regulated as such at a minimum with nondiscrimination rules. Less competition by the way results in higher prices and less

choices for consumers. We need to keep the Net a free and open platform for free flow of information, communication and commerce.

Data caps are unfair and at best are nothing more than unfair business practices that benefit no one but large service providers like yours. You should be investing in making your services work better and provide better customer service -- greater quality service, more affordable prices and encourage higher adoption of broadband access -- greater deployment unless there's more competition, choice and affordability is meaningless.

We need an Open Internet to remain that empowers greater public participation -- leading to higher broadband adoption, enables free flow of communication, information and commerce to continue unhindered in which packet discrimination of legal online packets is unacceptable. Don't let giant cable and phone companies create a new two-tiered Internet with so called managed services and destroy the Open Web as we know it. They say they may let a slow public lane that is nondiscriminatory remain but create a new closed lane that has so called managed services in it for which one must pay more for faster service and if unable to afford to do so or unwilling are stuck with inferior service. An Open Internet fosters creativity, empowers public participation, is a threat to the status quo of big cable and phone companies which is why they want to destroy it --- it is a level playing field that promotes openness and fairness for users and innovators alike. Some suggest maintaining Network Neutrality for fixed broadband and letting the mobile web have discrimination that too is unacceptable as mobile devices are the future -- more people will use smartphones or tablet computers in future to access the Internet and wireless service is the future. We need an Open Wireless Initiative.

Sincerely,

Mr. Maneesh Pangasa

Yuma AZ 85365

(928) 276-9041

(928) 446-8999

PS: Without an Open Internet the future Googles and Yahoos of the world, the future Facebook and Twitter's would not stand a chance. New upstarts would need permission to innovate and compete online and could not do so freely and openly. Facebook would not exist today without an Open

Internet. Noncommercial and nonprofit organizations would have a harder time reaching people online than the corporate funded groups who have the money and influence to pay extortion to the ISPs. Please investigate AT&T's unfair and discriminatory new policies for U Verse and DSL broadband. Don't let them put data caps on competing video and voice services online while exempting their own services unfairly from such restrictions. The Net must remain a level playing field free of geographic or political boundaries. Censorship whether its by government or corporations online is unacceptable. National oppressive governments of countries like Iran, North Korea, China etc where Internet is censored must be held accountable by their people for doing so. Discrimination by government or corporations is unacceptable.